UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA ATLANTA DIVISION

IN RE: PARAGARD PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	: MDL DOCKET NO. 2974 :
This document relates to:	: : 1:20-md-02974-LMM :
NAYELI GUERRERO	:
VS.	Civil Action No.:
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.;; TEVA WOMEN'S HEALTH, LLC; TEVA BRANDED PHARMACEUTICAL PRODUCTS R&D, INC.; THE COOPER COMPANIES, INC.; and COOPERSURGICAL, INC.	: : : : : : :
SHORT FORM	I COMPLAINT
Come(s) now the Plaintiff(s) nar	med below, and for her/their Complaint
against the Defendant(s) named below, in	ncorporate(s) the Second Amended Master
Personal Injury Complaint (Doc. No.	79), in MDL No. 2974 by reference.
Plaintiff(s) further plead(s) as follows:	
1. Name of Plaintiff placed with Par	ragard:
Nayeli Guerrero	
2. Name of Plaintiff's Spouse (if a party to the case):
-	

representative capacity) at time of filing of Plaintiff's ori complaint:	State	e of Residence of each Plaintiff (including any Plaintiff in
State of Residence of each Plaintiff at the time of Paragard placen California State of Residence of each Plaintiff at the time of Paragard remov California District Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and ven would be proper: United States District Court – Central District of California Defendants. (Check one or more of the following five (5) Defer against whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five		
State of Residence of each Plaintiff at the time of Paragard remove California District Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and vent would be proper: United States District Court – Central District of California Defendants. (Check one or more of the following five (5) Defendants whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five	com	plaint:
District Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and vent would be proper: United States District Court – Central District of California Defendants. (Check one or more of the following five (5) Defendants whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five		-
would be proper: United States District Court – Central District of California Defendants. (Check one or more of the following five (5) Defendants whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five		te of Residence of each Plaintiff at the time of Paragard removal
would be proper: United States District Court – Central District of California Defendants. (Check one or more of the following five (5) Defendants whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five		California
United States District Court – Central District of California Defendants. (Check one or more of the following five (5) Defendants whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five		
against whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five	Dis	strict Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and venu
against whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five	Dis	strict Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and venuuld be proper:
against whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five	Dis	strict Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and venuuld be proper:
	Dis	strict Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and venu uld be proper: United States District Court – Central District of California
Defendants are the only defendants against whom a Short	Dis wo	strict Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and venual duld be proper: United States District Court – Central District of California fendants. (Check one or more of the following five (5) Defendants.
Complaint may be filed. No other entity may be added as a defe	Dis wo	Strict Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and venually be proper: United States District Court – Central District of California fendants. (Check one or more of the following five (5) Defendants whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five

in a Short Form Complaint.):

X	A. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.
K	B. Teva Women's Health, LLC
X	C. Teva Branded Pharmaceutical Products R&D, Inc.
X	D. The Cooper Companies, Inc.
X	E. CooperSurgical, Inc.
9.	Basis of Jurisdiction
X	Diversity of Citizenship (28 U.S.C. § 1332(a))
	Other (if Other, identify below):
10.	

Date(s) Plaintiff had	Placing Physician(s) or	Date Plaintiff's Paragard was	Removal Physician(s) or other
Paragard placed (DD/MM/YYYY)	other Health Care Provider (include City and State)	Removed (DD/MM/YYYY)* *If multiple removal(s) or attempted removal procedures, list date of each separately.	Health Care Provider (include City and State)** **If multiple removal(s) or attempted removal procedures, list information separately.
01/01/2017	Planned Parenthood – Canoga Park Health Center 21001 Sherman Way. #9 Canoga Park, CA 91303	07/20/2021	Daniel Tannous, MD 9961 Sierra Ave. Fontana, CA 92335
		08/24/2021	Nora Bassiouni, MD 9961 Sierra Ave. Fontana, CA 92335

11.	Plaintiff alleges breakage (other than thread or string breakage) of her			
	Paragard upon removal.			
X	Yes			
	No			
12.	Brief statement of injury(ies) Plaintiff is claiming:			
	Significant pain and suffering, complicated medical interventions to remove broken Paragard,			
	loss of reproductive health, permanent impairment/disfigurement, and mental anguish.			
	Plaintiff reserves her right to allege additional injuries and			
	complications specific to her.			
13.	Product Identification:			
	a. Lot Number of Paragard placed in Plaintiff (if now known):			
	Unknown			
	b. Did you obtain your Paragard from anyone other than the			
	HealthCare Provider who placed your Paragard:			
	□ Yes			
	⊗ No			
14.	Counts in the Master Complaint brought by Plaintiff(s):			
X	Count I – Strict Liability / Design Defect			
X	Count II – Strict Liability / Failure to Warn			
X	Count III – Strict Liability / Manufacturing Defect			
X	Count IV – Negligence			
X	Count V – Negligence / Design and Manufacturing Defect			
X	Count VI – Negligence / Failure to Warn			

X	Cou	Count IX – Negligent Misrepresentation			
X	Cou	Count X – Breach of Express Warranty			
X	Cou	Count XI – Breach of Implied Warranty			
X	Cou	Count XII – Violation of Consumer Protection Laws			
X	Cou	Count XIII – Gross Negligence			
ĽX	Cou	Count XIV – Unjust Enrichment			
$\Box x$	Count XV – Punitive Damages				
	Count XVI – Loss of Consortium				
	Othe	Other Count(s) (Please state factual and legal basis for other claims			
not ii	nclude	ed in the Master Complaint below):			
15.		"Tolling/Fraudulent Concealment" allegations:			
	a. 🔯	Is Plaintiff alleging "Tolling/Fraudulent Concealment"? Yes			
		No			
	Ь.	If Plaintiff is alleging "tolling/fraudulent concealment" beyond			
	υ.	the facts alleged in the Master Complaint, please state the facts			
		and legal basis applicable to the Plaintiff in support of those			
		allegations below:			
		anegations below.			

16.	6. Count VII (Fraud & Deceit) and Count VIII (Fraud by Omiss			
	alleg	ations:		
	a.	Is Plaintiff is bringing a claim under Count VII (Fraud &		
		Deceit), Count VIII (Fraud by Omission), and/or any other claim		
		for fraud or misrepresentation?		
	\Box	Yes		
		No		
	b.	If Yes, the following information must be provided (in		
		accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and/or 9,		
		and/or with pleading requirements applicable to Plaintiff's state		
		law claims):		
	i.	The alleged statement(s) of material fact that Plaintiff alleges was false: Paragard more effective than other hormone free birth control methods.		
		Easily reversible. Easy to remove. Nonsurgical removal in routine office visit. Can be removed anytime. Omitted breakage at or near routine removal requiring complicated medical intervention		
	ii.	Who allegedly made the statement:		
	iii.	To whom the statement was allegedly made: Plaintiff and her physicians		
	iv.	The date(s) on which the statement was allegedly made:		
		Various dates while Plaintiff intended to and was implanted with Paragard		

- 17. If Plaintiff is bringing any claim for manufacturing defect and alleging facts beyond those contained in the Master Complaint, the following information must be provided:
 - a. What does Plaintiff allege is the manufacturing defect in her Paragard? It is currently unknown if Plaintiffs' specific lot was defectively manufactured. Plaintiff will supplement as discovery proceeds.

Plaintiff's demand for the relief sought if different than what is	
alleged	in the Master Complaint:
Jury De	mand:
Jury Tri	al is demanded as to all counts
Jury Tri	al is NOT demanded as to any count
-	
	5 1/1
	2r1Kbr
	Attorney(s) for Plaintiff
	Erin Copeland
	ı

1150 Bissonnet Street, Houston, TX 7	7005
713-751-0025	
ecopeland@fibichlaw.com	
SBN# 24028167/Federal ID# 29219	